



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,524	07/08/2003	Greta Arnaut	021565-083	9104

7590 05/26/2005

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

KUBELIK, ANNE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1638

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/614,524

Applicant(s)

ARNAUT ET AL.

Examiner

Anne R. Kubelik

Art Unit

1638

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 43-73 are pending.
2. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825.

Sequence identifiers are missing from Table II.

Full compliance with the sequence rules is required in response to this Office action. A complete response to this Office action must include both compliance with the sequence rules and a response to the issues set forth herein. Failure to fully comply with both of these requirements in the time period set forth in this Office action will be held to be non-responsive.

3. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence(s) of the specification or in an application data sheet by identifying the prior application by application number (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). If the prior application is a non-provisional application, the specific reference must also include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 59 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the

Art Unit: 1638

claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Parent claim 58 is drawn to a nucleic acid encoding amino acids 1-640 of SEQ ID NO:2, while claim 59 is drawn to that DNA encoding that protein or its fragment. Thus, the dependent claim does not include all of the limitations of the parent claim, and thus fails to further limit that claim.

5. Claims 49, 52-53, 56-57 and 63 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 49, it is suggested that --, wherein the plant is-- be inserted after "47" in line 1.

In claims 52-53, 56, line 1, "comprising" should be replaced with --, wherein the process comprises--.

In claim 57, a comma should be inserted after "seed".

In claim 63, "their" should be replaced with --its--.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claim is directed to a DNA deposited under a specific deposit number. Since the DNA is essential to the claimed invention, it must be obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification or otherwise be readily available to the public. If the DNA is not so

Art Unit: 1638

obtainable or available, a deposit of microorganism containing said DNA may satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 112. The specification does not disclose a repeatable process to obtain the DNA and it is not apparent if the DNA is readily available to the public. Thus, a deposit is required for enablement purposes.

If the deposit is made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicant, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, stating that the specific strain has been deposited under the Budapest Treaty and that the strain will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein.

If the deposit has not been made under the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposit meets the criteria set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.801-1.809, Applicant may provide assurance of compliance by an affidavit or declaration, or by a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, showing that

- (a) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;
- (b) all restrictions upon availability to the public will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;
- (c) the deposit will be maintained in a public depository for a period of 30 years or 5 years after the last request or for the enforceable life of the patent, whichever is longer;
- (d) a test of the viability of the biological material at the time of deposit (see 37 CFR 1.807); and,
- (e) the deposit will be replaced if it should ever become inviable.

In addition, the identifying information set forth in 37 CFR 1.809(d) should be added to the specification. See 37 CFR 1.801 - 1.809 [MPEP 2401-2411.05] for additional explanation of these requirements.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 43-57, 66-69 and 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. Dependent claims are included in all rejections.

Art Unit: 1638

Claim 43 is indefinite because what is deposited under BCCM-LMBP Accession No. LMBP 3986 is a plasmid in an E. coli, not a sequence. Additionally, “comprising an... same protein” should be replaced with --an isolated DNA encoding SEQ ID NO:2”.

Claims 44-45, 50 and 52-54 are indefinite for being dependent upon cancelled claim 1.

Claim 66 lacks antecedent basis for the limitation “The bacterium”.

Claims 52-53, 67-68 and 72-73 are indefinite because they lack agreement between the preamble of the methods and the positive method steps. Methods must be circular; the final step must generate the item the method is intended to produce. The method of killing insects in claim 52 ends in contacting insects with host cells, when it should end in killing insects. The method of obtaining a plant with resistance to insects in claim 53 ends in regenerating plants that are resistant to insects, when it should end in regenerating a plant that is resistant to insects. The method of controlling insects in claim 67 ends in contacting insects with a host cell, when it should end in the controlling insects. The method of obtaining plants with resistance to insects in claim 68 ends in regenerating plants, when it should end in obtaining plants with resistance to insects. The method of protecting a plant from *Sesamia nonagriodes* in claim 72 ends in growing a plant in a field, when it should end in protecting a plant from *Sesamia nonagriodes*. The method for controlling *Sesamia nonagriodes* in claim 73 ends in expressing a DNA in a plant, when it should end in controlling *Sesamia nonagriodes*.

Claims 55, 57, 69 and 71 are indefinite because they lack agreement between the preamble of the methods and the positive method steps. The plants claims are all drawn to methods of obtaining plants with resistance to insects, while dependent claims 55, 57, 69 and 71 are all drawn to processes that go further to the production of seeds.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 58-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baum et al (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0237111A1, filed 15 September 1999).

Baum et al teach a nucleic acid encoding amino acids 1-640 of the instant SEQ ID NO:2 (see their SEQ ID NOs:62-63; ¶37). Baum et al also teach host cells and plants transformed with the nucleic acid (¶132-187 and 279-304). The process for producing and growing those plants would inherently be a process for protecting a plant from *Sesamia nonagriodes* or for controlling *Sesamia nonagriodes*, given that the method steps are identical.

12. Claim 44 is free of the prior art, given the failure of the prior art to teach or suggest a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:1. The closest prior art is Baum et al (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0237111A1, filed 15 September 1999), who teach a nucleic acid encoding a protein with 99.6% identity to SEQ ID NO:1 (see sequence search results). Claim 43 is free of the prior art because the specification indicates that the plasmid that is deposited under BCCM-LMBP Accession No. 3986 comprises SEQ ID NO:1.

13. The prior art status of claims 45-57 could not be determined as they are dependent upon a canceled claim and do not recite any DNA sequence.

Art Unit: 1638

14. Claim 44 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35

U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

*Conclusion*

15. No claim is allowed.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne R. Kubelik, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0801. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amy Nelson, can be reached at (571) 272-0804. The central fax number for official correspondence is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Anne R. Kubelik, Ph.D.  
May 18, 2005



ANNE KUBELIK, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER